

## Article

# Reintegration, Hospitality and Hostility

## Song-writing and Song-sharing in Criminal Justice

Alison Urie, Fergus McNeill, Lucy Cathcart Frödén, Jo Collinson Scott, Phil Crockett Thomas, Oliver Escobar, Sandy Macleod and Graeme McKerracher<sup>30</sup>

**Abstract** *Distant Voices* is an ongoing, interdisciplinary collaborative action research project, drawing on criminology, community development, politics, practice-led research and song-writing to explore crime, punishment and reintegration through creative conversations that aim to challenge and unsettle understandings of and approaches to rehabilitation and reintegration. In this paper, we discuss some of the thinking behind the project and we reflect on our experiences to date as a community of enquiry. Specifically, we explore the extent to which certain practices of hospitality that we have experienced in processes of collaborative song-writing and song-sharing might mediate and resist the ‘hostile environment’ that faces people leaving prison in many contemporary societies. Drawing on our experience, we argue that hospitality is often disruptive; that creating and sustaining hospitable environments is extremely challenging; and that to do so requires careful thought and planning, including in relation to problems created by the power dynamics intrinsic to criminal justice. The paper includes links to and discussion of one song written in the project – ‘An Open Door’ – which engages with and illustrates these themes.

**Keywords** Punishment, rehabilitation, reintegration, hospitality, hostile environments

### Introduction: Reintegration in a Hostile Climate

Even the most cursory engagement with criminological and sociological work around reintegration, resettlement or ‘re-entry’ suggests that finding a way home from

---

<sup>30</sup> This paper was initially drafted 50-50 by Alison Urie and Fergus McNeill. Their reflections are the main focus here, but are rooted in the collective learning of *Distant Voices*. The paper has been refined and improved by the other named authors (and by the comments of the anonymous reviewers, to whom we are grateful). The project that was designed by Alison Urie, Fergus McNeill, Jo Collinson Scott and Oliver Escobar. Phil Crockett Thomas is the project’s research associate and principal fieldworker. Lucy Cathcart Frödén is undertaking an associated doctoral research project. Sandy Macleod and Graeme McKerracher are members of the core group who were involved in developing and/or undertaking some of the fieldwork discussed in this paper. More broadly, the learning generated in the *Distant Voices* project is the product of a much wider collaborative effort that includes our core group and the community of enquiry from which it is drawn. Though the responsibility for this paper rests with the named authors, we wish to acknowledge that the ideas presented in this paper have been shaped by the diverse experience and contributions of the core group and the community of enquiry.



punishment – and/or recovering or securing a place of belonging – is often extremely difficult. Criminologists have argued that failing to support people in these transitions undermines other kinds of person-centred rehabilitative efforts and investments, like prison-based education and training (Burke, Collett and McNeill, 2018). More broadly, post-punishment reintegration is profoundly affected not just by the material conditions that face the returning citizen but also by their socio-cultural reception (Miller, 2014; Nugent and Schinkel, 2016; Western, 2018).

Understandings of reintegration remain seriously underdeveloped both in criminological theory and in criminal justice policy and practice (Kirkwood and McNeill, 2015). Indeed, as critical policy studies scholars suggest (Bacchi, 2009), many ‘policy problems’ are produced in ways which reflect and promote certain assumptions, representations and interests. Thus, problems of reintegration are typically cast not as problems created by punishment itself but rather by certain attributes of the ‘offender’ that need to be ‘reformed’.<sup>31</sup> Discourses and practices are thus centred on the person’s readiness for release or their progress in rehabilitative processes, or the assessment and management of the risks or threats that they pose, or the development of their vocational skills and employability. In other words, the problem of reintegration is constructed around the question of whether ‘they’ are sufficiently rehabilitated such that ‘we’ (the supposedly ‘law-abiding’) might let ‘them’ back into ‘our’ society, rather than on whether we are ready, willing and able to receive them (Burke, et al., 2018). Having allowed people to be estranged through formal punishment, we now question whether they are sufficiently familiar – enough like ‘us’ – to be permitted to return home.

Similar concerns and confusions recur in the context of refugee integration. As Bauman (2016) argued in his book *Strangers at Our Door*, refugees have posed such questions throughout the history of human society. Rather than rising to the challenges of the refugee ‘crisis’<sup>32</sup> as Bauman suggests that we should – by recognising our growing inter-dependence and seeking new ways to find solidarity and to cooperate – in recent years, the UK Government has instead pursued a policy of actively creating a ‘hostile environment’ putatively targeted at ‘illegal immigrants’ but, in reality, adversely affecting all refugees and asylum seekers.<sup>33</sup> Rather than the prospect of welcome, the hostile environment aims to promote and project the anticipation of rejection; of closed rather than open doors.

---

<sup>31</sup> We place the stigmatising term ‘offender’ in quotation marks to highlight our unease with its implied typification of those processed through the criminal justice system as a class of persons different or distinct from others; and/or to resist the identification of people with their criminalised actions.

<sup>32</sup> We use quotation marks around ‘crisis’ here since we would question the construction of these events as a crisis, not least given the very small proportion of displaced persons around the world who came to Europe at that time, or indeed have come to Europe since the second world war.

<sup>33</sup> See: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/nov/28/hostile-environment-the-hardline-home-office-policy-tearing-families-apart> accessed 13<sup>th</sup> August 2019.

Though comparing the experiences and situations of these two populations is problematic in certain respects (see Kirkwood and McNeill, 2015), some criminologists and sociologists have long been critical of the ‘hostile environment’ created for people who have been processed through criminal justice (see Nugent and Schinkel, 2016, Western, 2018). Hostile penal and post-penal environments are often just one in a succession of their experiences of marginalisation and degradation such that, as one of us has noted elsewhere (McNeill, 2017, 2019), all of the associated ‘re-’ words that circulate in criminal justice discourses are rendered problematic:

Re-formation. Re-rehabilitation. Re-integration. Re-settlement. Re-entry. In French, Re-insertion. In German, Re-socialisation... these words spring [firstly] from the (philosophically) liberal assumption that there is a just order in which the ‘offender’ was once habilitated, integrated and settled and, secondly, by implication, that the challenge is replacing him or her in that social order; making him or her fit back in (McNeill, 2017).

It may be questionable whether these re-words ever made sense – even in the post-war era when a collectivist approach to social welfare influenced criminal justice as well as social policy (Garland, 1985) – but for Pat Carlen (2008) contemporary rehabilitation has become an ‘imaginary penalty’. Knowing that social reintegration is well-nigh impossible in late-modern social conditions, penal actors nonetheless sustain a rehabilitative imaginary in and through academic, professional and policy discourses and practices. Such ‘imaginary penalties’, she argues, restrain and disable critique, limiting our capacity to imagine the something better to which Bauman alludes. In exploring similar issues in the context of the USA, Loic Wacquant (2011: 613-614) puts it this way:

institutions of penal supervision after incarceration serve less to ‘reintegrate’ convicts who ‘reenter’ society than to cloak the glaring irrationality of the policy of penalization of poverty as the nefarious consequences of hyperincarceration accumulate and fester at the bottom of social and physical space. Denounced upstream and expunged from the prison itself, the welfarist myth of rehabilitation is revived and reactivated downstream after custody to help stage the resolve of the state to tackle the crime question on an individual, case-by-case basis. Only now this myth is deployed in a stripped-down, panoptic, and disciplinary variant high on symbolism and low on substance, guaranteed to have no more than a marginal impact on the endless recycling of millions of convicts.

Nonetheless, even taking account of pre-punishment hostility, of penal hostility and of post-penal hostility (exercised through both penal supervision and social reaction), in the *Distant Voices – Coming Home* project, we seek not to abandon hope of integration but rather to rethink its meaning, its practice and its implications. Charting a path to integration after crime and punishment, we suggest, can and should be part of criminology’s political work – and a duty of all citizens. But to move beyond merely critical ‘criminologies of disappointment’ bemoaning this state of affairs, we need to

find resources to imagine how this might be done (Loader and Sparks, 2012). In *Distant Voices* therefore, we seek to carve out a space for developing alternative approaches that can suspend, disrupt and perhaps sometimes displace conventional discourses and practices. To that end, we explore how to make ‘coming home’ a possibility, primarily by using song-writing as a creative method for understanding and imagining processes and understandings of integration that might challenge and change hostile environments. The challenge might be at the micro-level (of personal interactions, relations and practices) or the macro level (of social conditions and climates for integration).

In this paper, we aim to elaborate in further detail our initial research design and to reflect upon some of the early lessons from trying to put it into practice. We include some data below not from a completed analysis (this is ongoing work) but rather – in a much more limited, selective and partial way – to illustrate some of the key themes that we have identified by reflecting together on our work-in-progress. We focus on our experience in one, small, local prison which accommodates adult men in pre-trial detention and serving sentences of varying lengths. In particular we highlight the complexities and challenges of hospitality, suggesting that it interrupts our selves and disrupts our social settings, but we argue that these interruptions and disruptions are necessary to and critical in the project of imagining something better than the hostility that prevails today.

### **Research Design: Making, Sharing and Learning**

The *Distant Voices – Coming Home* project began in 2017 with 3-year funding from the UK Economic and Social Research Council (ref: ES/P002536/1). Its formal aims are (1) to improve academic and public understandings of social re/integration after punishment; (2) to develop innovative practices to better support re/integration;<sup>34</sup> and (3) to better engage a range of citizens, communities and civil society institutions in re/integration. The research team includes expertise in community development, criminology, practice-led research using song-writing, political science, public policy and sociology. This team comprises part of and facilitates a still wider community of enquiry including artists, musicians, people with lived experience of punishment and re/integration (and their families), criminal justice practitioners and others. From this community of enquiry, a broadly representative ‘core group’ of 15-20<sup>35</sup> has been formed to guide the project. Our work is oriented by the following research questions:

1. How do individual citizens and civil society institutions experience, make sense of and engage in re/integration after punishment – whether as citizens ‘coming home’ or as those receiving them?
2. How and with what effects does making and sharing art (principally songs) (a) represent and (b) support re/integration? How can we best understand the

---

<sup>34</sup> We use the form ‘re/integration’ deliberately to leave open the questions of whether and to what extent the returning person was integrated in the first place.

<sup>35</sup> The core group’s membership has fluctuated a little over the life of the project as people’s situations and commitments have changed, but we have sustained a balance between different kinds of expertise.

social, political, ethical and aesthetic nature and potential of these encounters and what they reveal about re/integration?

3. To what extent and in what ways can culturally mediated public dialogue about re/integration enable the development of social relations and social capital, supporting citizen and civil society engagement in re/integration?
4. To what extent and in what ways does participation in co-creative enquiry and public dialogue stimulate wider individual and community participation in other aspects of social and political life beyond the question of reintegration (e.g. policy processes, elections, community action)?

To explore these questions, our methodological approach is that of collaborative action research (Dickens and Watkins, 1999; Platteel et al., 2010), combining creative practice, social science-based and arts-based research methods, and concurrent knowledge exchange. In two pilot phases of the project, we discovered that approaching the subject of re/integration obliquely through the co-creative activity of song-writing (described in more detail in the next section) rather than directly (for example, through interviewing) allowed us to better elicit and explore some of its complexities and ambiguities (see Anderson, 2015; McNeill, 2015). Moreover, we learned that these co-creative processes themselves generated social relationships, social capital and thus community. In the ongoing project, we have begun to pay more attention to how, to what extent and under what conditions this community-building happens – not just among participants co-writing songs in song-writing ‘sessions’ but also through events where songs and the stories behind them are shared. Crucially, we have also begun to explore the potential contribution of these culturally mediated processes of dialogue to developing more participatory politics.

Maximising our learning depends on the academic contributors respecting (and developing) our collaborators and participants as co-researchers, just as they respect (and develop) us as co-creators and co-participants. Therefore, the research team and core group have been trying to facilitate a community of enquiry that learns in and through three sets of activities. Though we originally labelled these as inquiry, dialogue and discovery, we have since adopted the simpler terms ‘making’, ‘sharing’ and ‘learning’. We focus on ‘making’ and ‘sharing’ in the next two sections of the paper, but it is important to note that the relationships between these sets of activities are not sequential; rather, they are iterative – with each influencing and shaping the development of the other.

Through all of these activities, we collect and analyse data in an effort to better understand those experiences and practices. For example, in song-writing ‘sessions’, the researcher writes an observational fieldwork diary, records and summarises reflective ‘debrief’ meetings of the project team facilitating the session, and records reflective conversations with each participant. The songs themselves also constitute a key form of data – not just in relation to their lyrics, but also in relation to their sounds. In events where we share the songs with a range of audiences, we usually seek responses through feedback postcards and brief audio-recorded interviews with attendees. In smaller settings, we record the event in its entirety and analyse the discussions of the songs. We also record feedback about gigs and online publications in the form of email communications, reviews and press reporting.

Our work is broadly ethnographic in character, but it is also collaborative. Participant observation sometimes uses an approach that has referred to as ‘shadowing’ (used and refined by McNeill before: see Halliday et al., 2008; Czarniawska 2008). In shadowing, ‘following’ social actors has been found to generate rich data from ‘multiple observational areas within their geographic, organizational, or political settings’ (Yanow 2009: 294). But rather than shadowing, in *Distant Voices* we have tried to develop a form of collaborative participant observation which allows ‘mirroring’ between differently situated actors (for somewhat similar approaches to penal ethnographies, see Bosworth et al., 2005 and Piche et al, 2014). For example, in the collection of session data discussed above, we are enabling and recording reflections from each of the differently situated participants; researchers, session leaders and participants.

Managing and making sense of all this data is no small task; and trying, as far as possible, to undertake analysis collaboratively with the core group is also challenging, given the inequalities of time, resources and research experience within the group. We convene quarterly core group meetings to critically reflect together upon what we have experienced in the making and sharing activities and on the data generated within them, as well as seeking to guide the next steps in the process. One important approach, initially imagined by our colleague Jo Collinson Scott and which we have elaborated together, involves working together to develop what we term ‘TREES’: Tiny Research Enquiries and Explorations. Working individually or in pairs or trios (involving and/or supported by an experienced researcher) each of us has generated new lines of enquiry to explore either by analysing our existing data or by generating new material. Some TREES use social science methods (for example, conducting interviews or focus groups to explore dialogue with specific groups around particular songs); others adopt more creative arts-based approaches, for example developing our understanding of the issues raised in one song through the practice of writing another in response. We discuss one such TREE in the penultimate section of the paper.

### **Making – Practices of Disruption**

When this paper was first drafted and presented at a conference, we were just past midway through a 3-year process, which included running twenty-two 2-3 day song-writing ‘Vox Sessions’<sup>36</sup> (hereafter referred to as ‘sessions’) in 4 different prisons (1 open and 3 closed institutions) and in two community justice settings (one in Glasgow, Scotland’s largest city, and one in Inverness, often referred to as the capital of the rural Highlands). These sessions, which we have since completed, engaged over 200 participants including people in prison or under criminal justice supervision and their families or supporters, criminal justice staff, victims and their families or supporters, academics, artists and representatives of community groups and civil society. The sessions were the main locus of our attempts to address questions 1 and 2 (above) by

---

<sup>36</sup> Vox Sessions were initially designed by Vox Liminis, and developed through a Big Lottery Investing in Ideas grant in 2013.



new rules – group exercise during a songwriting session

discussing, representing and experiencing re/integration principally in and through song-writing.<sup>37</sup>

Much of our research fieldwork has taken place in and through these sessions. In this section, we draw on material from sessions in one small local prison in Inverness (the largest town in the Scottish highlands), the population of which includes people awaiting trial or sentence, and people serving sentences of varying lengths. In the sessions, as far as each setting allows, we bring diverse participants together to creatively and collaboratively explore a theme somehow related to re/integration, such as ‘Open Return’, ‘Waiting’, ‘Taking the Plunge’, ‘Bridges’ etc. In a prison context, a group of eight to ten participants might include prisoners, prison staff, and local community members. In a community justice setting, the group might include community justice practitioners (social workers or probation officers), former prisoners, people on community sentences, victims and people who study crime and punishment. These mixed groups work together with a session team that usually includes a facilitator, up to three musician-songwriters and an academic researcher. The musicians are usually paired with between 2 and 4 participants, co-writing a song with each one. Typically, therefore, by the end of a three-day process, each participant has co-written (with one of

<sup>37</sup> Weekly gatherings in Glasgow (called ‘Vox Unbound’) to share food and engage in creative activities provide continuity of contact for many participants, and form an ongoing community for some of those involved.



the musicians) and recorded a new song, and these are shared in an end-of-session ‘playback’ in which the group reflects on their individual and collective experience.

The sessions however, are not only about making songs related to re/integration: We are also attempting to enact it through the creative community that each session constitutes, albeit in a transitory and limited way. The following abridged extract from the second author’s fieldnotes from one session exemplify the process:

### **Monday**

We pass through the prison entry rituals fairly swiftly and easily this time. There is a sense of us as familiar faces to the staff – and a measure of associated trust in the light-touch security.

Our venue for the next few days, in some ways, feels more like a drug rehab than a prison. We are only about 20 metres from the outer gate, and don’t have to enter the

interior security fencing. Instead, turning left from the rear of the gatehouse we go through a blue-painted iron gate in an old stone wall into an open courtyard (maybe 15 or 20 metres squared) ...

At the top of this courtyard is the entrance to the ‘Women’s Re-integration Unit’. It is empty because no women fit the criteria to be in it. The entrance corridor is narrow; to the left is a large galley kitchen, straight ahead is the toilet, to the right is the main space. It contains a couple of sofas, a half-dozen stacking chairs, a desk and PC with office chair, and a door through to another corridor. Off that corridor are a number of rooms that might serve as cells or small meeting rooms. Some have one-way mirror arrangements (for observed visits?). The corridor dog-legs right into another corridor with smaller rooms off it and a recessed gym area with a few CV machines.

Our main space is a kind of sitting room. Comfortable enough but hideously decorated with (Ikea?) floral prints; predictably gendered and, for me, pretty alienating when set alongside the institutionalised furniture.

D Schön and Lynn [the prison officers present] gravitate to the desk and office chairs. Our two outside participants (BigzMarky and John) arrive as we set up. Both are pretty quiet. It is hectic; there aren’t enough mugs for the coffee. Lisa (a teacher in the prison), who has just arrived, goes to find us some polystyrene cups. The men from the prison arrive soon after – Ally, ‘A’, Albert, ‘N’ and ‘J’. Immediately, I am struck by the uniform divisions, marking out staff, prisoners and outsiders, but we seem to mix pretty well from the start.



Dave [facilitator] does the intros, Ross [musician] sings Death Pact and Donna [musician] sings Fuck It Button (with Emma [musician] and Ross joining in). As usual, the songs break the ice – allowing us to share a few laughs already, and impressing the participants both with what can be done in a few days and with the musicians' skills.

After a brief round of introductions, we set about the pictures exercise. It is all a little cramped but seems to work well in terms of participation and engagement. Lots of potential lyrics are generated and we pick out our favourites and share them.

Over the next couple of hours, we brain-dump on the theme ['Are you ready?'], generate song titles (one word, alliterative, mysterious), explore the 'three questions' (who is speaking, to whom, saying what), and look at song structure (beginning, middle, end).

By lunchtime, D Schön has been drawn into writing a song rather than (as he had expected) just observing and supervising the session) [...]

### **Tuesday**

We bring in everyone's favourite biscuits or chocolate. The gesture is much appreciated [...]

The laughter continues – Donna leads an activity putting our newspaper clipping lyrics to music... which introduces the meme of Ross 'vibing it out' [i.e. improvising]; one that sticks for the rest of the session. Emma resists the imposed chord structure – the muddling through, messing it up, negotiating a way forward together -- all seems to send a positive message: 'It's OK for the process to be messy. It doesn't need to be frictionless. We'll get there.'

At one point an alarm rings – it's an officer's personal alarm. D Schön leaps into action (he later told me the alarm was from somewhere in proximity to our venue) but hardly anyone else notices. Too busy in our own headspace. An alarm that fails to alarm, then. D Schön quickly returns. [...]

### **Wednesday**

[...] The playback feels like a moment (or even a ritual?) of integration. Each of us has something to share and hopes that it will be accepted and appreciated. [A prison manager] and the Deputy Governor join us. The Dep looks a bit forbidding, but his reaction to the first song – BigzMarky's 12 step rap – is warm and highly appreciative. The songs are played in turn... Everyone is in it together; everyone is proud, inspired, moved. The Dep says it is the best hour he has spent in 28 years in the SPS [Scottish Prison Service].

As the group disintegrates (prisoners the first to go), there is much gratitude to the musicians and to everyone for throwing themselves into it. Several of the participants say that they'll try to drop in to the office... when they are next in Glasgow. These feel like sincere promises – like real connections.

In our experience – and in the accounts of many participants – a key feature of the sessions is the mutual, reciprocal gestures and practices of hospitality that they encourage and enable. Particularly in a prison project, the facilitators and researcher are

entering an environment where some of the participants live and work, but which none own and from which some cannot leave. At the same time, the project team is the host of the session as a process but in an institutional environment the team can't control.

For example, during the session discussed in the extract above, a local community member with experience of 'recovery' and a prison officer both reflected on the outcomes that they perceive from coming together in this way. 'BigzMarky'<sup>38</sup> commented:

Everyone coming together, it's definitely an eye-opener. Can see everyone is getting a good release from writing and learning about music in general which helps make a stronger community. We all sort of relate to each other through that. It's all good. It's definitely something I can take out with this environment; take it back into... everyday society. If it can be done between 4 walls, it can be done in the wider world. (BigzMarky, community participant involved in local recovery networks).

Another participant who was a prison officer, and who had been asked to take part in the session at short notice and without much context, reflected on how the process levelled differences between people in the group:

It's almost like the flat surface that you would lay a spirit level on. Everyone comes in and they come from, not maybe different backgrounds, but different standings within the community: Day 1 was very much, well, I was a prison officer, those were the inmates, these were the musicians, the community guys. By day 3 we're all the same. By day 3 everybody's, we're talking about music, and there's a level of comfort that I don't think anything else could achieve in such a quick space of time... [cos] although we're talking about this being achieved by day 3, I think it was far earlier in the process that everybody was comfortable with each other and again, that's really refreshing. (D Schön, prison officer).

In one sense, D Schön's comments echo other accounts of psychologically immersive experiences and, more generally, of the joys associated with being absorbed in acquiring or developing existing skills – of craftwork (Sennett, 2008). As Janet Murray argues (1997: 98):

Immersion is a metaphorical term derived from the physical experience of being submerged in water. We seek the same feeling from a psychologically immersive experience that we do from a plunge in the ocean or swimming pool: the sensation of being surrounded by a completely other reality, as different as water is from air, that takes

---

<sup>38</sup> After a wider discussion exploring ethical issues, participants in sessions make an informed decision about whether they wish to be referred to by their own name, by an 'artist name' (as in this case) or by a pseudonym.

over all of our attention, our whole perceptual apparatus (Murray, 1997: 98).

Of course, immersion of this sort in a creative activity can never fully escape the carceral reality of the prison environment in which it takes place. Nor can it escape the dynamics of power and control that attend such environments. Rather than ignoring these influences, we try to attend to the ways in which each project takes on a distinct identity shaped by the activity of song-writing, by the group and by the environment. Even in the relatively less constraining context of community-based sessions, this requires and involves a planned and carefully facilitated process rooted, as far as possible, in the values and principles of community development praxis which Margaret Ledwith (2005) describes as an ‘ideology of equality’:

Democratic values of respect, dignity, reciprocity, and mutuality together form a practical framework for checking the validity of everything we do in the name of community development, from personal encounters to global action (Ledwith, 2005: 3).

But although the project aspires both in sessions and in our wider community of enquiry to achieve shared ownership across diverse participants (the ‘spirit level’ effect), drawing on the work of Heron (2005) and Freire (2000), we acknowledge that, for groups of diverse participants to realize or even approach an ideology of equality, someone first has to take up the leadership that resides in facilitation:

The central tension involved in deliberative facilitation can be expressed in terms of ‘following from the front’. The facilitator necessarily occupies a leadership position in the deliberating group, yet must follow the group as it unfolds its own discourse on the issue at hand. The facilitator is both part of the structure within which deliberation is supposed to emerge, and self-evidently a participant in the actual discourse itself. Yet the facilitator is a special kind of participant in the deliberative process – she is in a privileged position with respect to the other participants (Moore, 2012: 147).

It becomes a task therefore for the facilitator-leader to work towards enabling the group to name and share the intersectional powers inherent within it, in more transparent and equitable ways. As Bussu and Bartels (2013: 3) argue, ‘[f]acilitative leadership... emerges from the activity of working with others to achieve results everyone can agree to: it is about serving rather than steering.’

For example, prior to a session, the facilitators and researchers have agenda-setting power; they determine the theme and they use their skills and experience to design the process through which to explore it. Both the theme and the design are subsequently held lightly and are often changed as the group and other environmental and cultural factors move the project from imagination into reality. To create a hospitable space where people situated in very different institutional roles (e.g. as prisoners and staff) feel safe and thus able to engage in a process that requires personal investment is a complex challenge. Facilitators must therefore pay close attention to the detail of the group’s

mood, culture, tone, and space. Ultimately, these sessions often require quite strong, if highly responsive, leadership to create a space hospitable enough for the group to form and function.

Returning to the theme of immersion that we introduced above, early in the development of Distant Voices our colleague Graeme McKerracher suggested thinking about Vox Sessions through the lens of Temporary Autonomous Zones (or TAZ). Kester Brewin (2011) uses anarchist Hakim Bey's (2003) concept of the TAZ to explore spaces of disruption, likening the concept to an unexpected snow-day. You wake up, open the curtains, and realise that there is two feet of snow outside the window, and all the roads are white. Schools are closed, and work is cancelled because all transport is cancelled. Suddenly the day shifts from the norm, and your day is perhaps spent sledging, or shovelling snow. Everyone is shaken out of the hum-drum routine of life. Passers-by smile. Maybe neighbours who barely know each other spend time clearing snow together. The normal rules are suspended and, temporarily, new rules begin to emerge. Drawing from Bey's (2003: 95) definition of TAZ as being 'like an uprising which does not engage directly with the State, a guerrilla operation which liberates an area (of land, of time, of imagination) and then dissolves itself to re-form elsewhere/elsewhen, before the State can crush it', Brewin (2011) suggests that TAZ are spaces where we are best able to encounter the 'other', where these disruptive dynamics provide a glimpse that inspires our imaginations of how things might be. He asks whether change is more likely to come from the TAZ, rather than from plans informed by permanence or utopianism. In *Distant Voices – Coming Home*, we try, within numerous constraints, to form and host TAZ-like spaces within the criminal justice system so as to imagine something new in and through making new things. That said, we are not seeking such a direct engagement or violent confrontation with the state as Bey perhaps imagines or implies. Rather, we notice that sessions often constitute heterotopic spaces, in Foucault's terms; single physical places where multiple and contradictory sites and spaces are constituted and reconstituted – as sites and spaces of control and change, of cooperation and resistance, of reflection and of projection/performance – exist in tension, challenging one another.

In the temporary communities of sessions, where normal roles and rules are disrupted, relational spaces emerge for something new and different to be made. For many participants, spending time in these interstitial spaces results in new ways of relating and new ways of seeing the 'other'.

Paraphrasing Derrida, Westmoreland describes hospitality as an interruption to the host's self:

Derrida claims that 'we thus enter from the inside: the master of the house is at home, but nonetheless he comes to enter his home through the guest—who comes from outside.' In welcoming the guest, the self is interrupted (Westmoreland, 2008: 6).

As we have already noted, in sessions different people are hosts and guests in different ways and in different senses. For example, in a prison-based session, those imprisoned in the space are nonetheless hosts of the visiting project team as guests, although it is others (the staff) who hold the keys to the door and who offer formal admission. But the project

team hosts the participants in the song-writing process. Different kinds of participants are differently situated, holding different forms of power and authority, the significance of which ebb and flow as sessions unfold. For all participants however, there is at least the possibility that the self may be interrupted in one way or another.

In fieldnotes from another session in HMP Inverness in July 2017, the second author (McNeill), described these various interacting practices of hospitality:

The parts played by the banal and the beautiful aspects of crafting integration are interesting and inter-connected. Human hospitality seems to relate to a performed recognition of respect for one another's basic needs; but it also creates the conditions of story-sharing (as if around the table); and story-sharing is the basis of making beautiful things out of our stories. The beautiful things then seem to elevate the meaning and power of the stories; and to recognize our capacity to craft them and ourselves in new ways. The song is an embodiment of the sharing and the learning together – and the mutual recognition that this allows and requires.

At the end of the same session, a prisoner nearing the end of his sentence commented:

...just finding myself and for me, it's a form of integration. So, this to me – as strange as it may sound – didn't feel like I was in jail. This felt more of a community-based thing. So, it kinda', at the right time for me, being close to going outside the wall again, kinda' just opened my eyes to – not a prison way of life because I've accepted that – but this was more like a community way of life which I thought was beautiful (Steven Robinson, prisoner participant).

A prison staff member reflected:

But I do think it is brilliant, everyone's mixed and there's no difference between any of us, prisoner or staff and that's the way it should be. That's the way it should be. It's good to see the guys seeing you struggle and it's good to see them and the talent they've got. It's been fantastic, it has blown me away... Being part of it has been an eye opener, as I said emotionally and lovely to see a couple of my guys working, that I work with. That was lovely to see them working instead of cutting themselves down all the time because that's what they do. But no, I have been very uplifted in my heart with that... (Lolly, prison-based health practitioner).

For some, 'absolute hospitality' requires the guest to be welcomed without condition (Westmoreland, 2008). Discussing community music as a practice of hospitality, Lee Higgins (2012) suggests that we should aspire to this kind of unconditional, absolute hospitality. But he simultaneously concedes that without rules or agreed aspirational virtues, integrating others is impossible:

How can we possibly unconditionally welcome all-comers into our various bands, choirs, and orchestras, regardless of their abilities and skills? How could we ‘give place’ to them all without entering into reciprocal agreements that include being punctual, practicing, and extending a generosity of spirit toward other group members? (Higgins, 2012: 6).

Our experience is similar: Absolute hospitality is not realizable in a session where different actors hold different forms of power to set or shape the terms of engagement. While advocating for receptivity of the guest on the guest’s terms, the theologian and priest Henri Nouwen (who has extensive experience of living in L’Arche integrative communities) argues that:

We are not hospitable when we leave our house to strangers and let them use it any way they want. An empty house is not a hospitable house... When we want to be really hospitable we not only have to receive strangers but also to confront them by an unambiguous presence... We can enter into communication with the other only when our own life choices, attitudes and viewpoints offer the boundaries that challenge strangers to become aware of their own position and to explore it critically (Nouwen, 1975: 71).

The hospitality of the session is similarly structured – for each different kind of host and guest (e.g. whether a host in the place and guest in the process, or a host of the process and guest in the place) there is a challenge to become aware, to explore, to adapt and to share. The prison sets conditions on access; the team exercises power in the design and facilitation of a safe but satisfying process; the participants retain the power to determine how much and what to share and, ultimately (since participation is always voluntary) whether to stay or leave.

### **Sharing – Practices of Interruption**

As the main means of addressing research questions 3 and 4 above, we have designed a series of ways to share songs written in Vox Sessions. In May 2018, we released a studio-recorded album of 10 songs (‘Not Known at this Address’<sup>39</sup>) written in the second pilot phase of the project or in its first year. Coinciding with that release, we ran a series of 12 gigs and other events in various settings from mainstream music venues (reaching audiences of up to 600), to criminal justice conferences, to prisons, to people’s homes.

In these six smaller ‘house gigs’ (with audiences as small as 12), we worked with people involved in the community of enquiry to host their family, friends, neighbors and acquaintances; allowing a more intimate dialogue with the songs to develop in these domestic spaces. Through these various events, we tried to collect data about how and to what extent they functioned as sites of dialogue about re/integration. We have also

---

<sup>39</sup> The album is available here: <https://www.voxliminis.co.uk/media/distant-voices-not-known-at-this-address/>, accessed 16<sup>th</sup> August 2019.



album launch gig at Hidden Door 2018, Leith Theatre, Edinburgh

developed a website<sup>40</sup> that shares the work and invites public responses, publishing not just songs but also podcasts and other sorts of digital media. Songs from the album have achieved national radio play and the project has secured considerable and positive press coverage.<sup>41</sup>

One regular response from people interacting with these songs for the first time is to comment on their surprise (and sometimes joy) at what they share in common with the song-writers; people who they may have assumed to be quite different from them. One woman at a House Gig reflected:

It's nice how so many of the stories of the songs that have been sung create... they're universal messages... I find myself thinking about my Dad, who's never been in prison. You're welling up with your own relationship. It's so nice that it's created something that... To be honest I thought I was going to be listening to a lot of stories of people in the prison system, and it's great that their stories have been elevated to a stage where they talk [*implied: to issues*] so much broader than that.

---

<sup>40</sup> See: [www.distantvoices.org.uk](http://www.distantvoices.org.uk), accessed 16<sup>th</sup> August 2019.

<sup>41</sup> For example, see: <https://www.thescottishsun.co.uk/tvandshowbiz/2685648/prisoners-barlinnie-castle-huntly-album-launch-scottish-indie-stars-admiral-fallow-delgados/>, accessed 16<sup>th</sup> August 2019

Other initial reactions to hearing the work include surprise at the quality of the songs, and comments on the way that they might allow marginalized people's perspectives and experiences to be heard, albeit in a mediated way. For example, a recent gig attendee commented:

I really appreciate the fact that these amazing song writers have used their immense talent to give a voice to people who are generally forgotten by the general public and 'lost' in the system. I think the most effective way to rehabilitate people is to assure them that they have value and are heard.

That this quote tends to celebrate the musicians and perhaps patronizes their co-writers is unsurprising since public events attract a mixed audience who seem to attend for different reasons and with different degrees of insight into criminal justice. Some are brought along by the reputations of the musicians performing, some by friends, and some by a professional or personal interest in the subject matter. A retired probation officer came to a recent gig at the invitation of a friend. He reflected at the end of the evening:

...there was a moment through one of the songs in the concert when I thought, this is about civil society reclaiming responsibility or whatever, for issues arising out of crime and punishment. And it almost took me back historically to the late 19th Century where albeit, it was the Methodists, but it was about civil society, through that form, taking responsibility and not letting the state and its media ogre the Daily Mail run things. Essentially musicians and people in prison working together. Musicians as part of civil society...

However, finding ways to engage the public with the work while simultaneously growing the community behind it, and researching it, is not without complications. Competing requirements and interests are in constant tension. For example, managing the risks of potential negative exposure for those involved (both musicians and criminal justice co-writers), alongside the aspiration to engage the press in sharing the work, is challenging. Ethically, we try to recognize the authorship of everyone involved in the song-writing, but in helping people to make informed decisions about anonymity or attribution, we need to balance their right to recognition against the risk of adverse media coverage that might hinder their re/integration. Similarly, we do not want to ask musicians to represent something or someone in a way that conflicts with their values or generates risks to their professional identity or reputation.

The norms of the press don't help this situation: Journalists tend to want to cover the project through the lens of a single person's 'redemption script' (Maruna, 2001), rather than focusing on systemic or structural issues. For example, during a press campaign to mark the launch of *Not Known at this Address*, a reporter pushed for access to and involvement of a former prisoner involved in the album as a condition of their coverage. While we remain in contact with a number of people who had written songs in prisons that featured on the album, those who seemed to us most reflective about the risks, and





listening to songs at a public event

hence least vulnerable, didn't want to speak to the journalist. So, we made the decision not to ask the others. The challenges of treading the line between the duty to protect participants and the risks of paternalism recur throughout the project.

Another challenge concerns the questions of 'voice' and participation in public events and activities. We are sometimes asked by audience members whether the performers are all 'ex-offenders', and if not, why not. While we do encourage everyone involved to perform the work they make, we aim to do so at a level that seems appropriate to the skills and experience required by the context and purpose of the performance. So, while an amateur musician will often perform their own work in, say, a small group project or local venue, we entrust the task of performing in major public events to the musicians who have the professional skills required for and the experience of playing to such audiences. An audience member from a recent gig sums up some of these complexities well in the following comment:

I think it's a really interesting idea: using song can be a lot more immediate and might engage people who would not read (or might not be sympathetic towards) a prose narrative of prisoners' experiences. Something like this could be seen as exploitative if it wasn't handled sensitively, but I thought this was handled very well and seemed to have entered into a genuine spirit of collaboration. I was wondering how the prisoner's own experiences of the project [were] different from the musicians' and would have liked to have seen

one of the performances that the (ex-) prisoners participated in directly.

The feminist writer bell hooks (1989), in discussing ‘voice’ in interactions between an oppressed community and professionals, comments:

Often this speech about the ‘other’ annihilates, erases. No need to hear your voice when I can talk about you better than you can speak about yourself. No need to hear your voice. Only tell me about your pain. I want to know your story. And then I will tell it back to you in a new way. Tell it back to you in such a way that it has become mine, my own. Re-writing you I write myself a new. I am still author, authority. I am still the coloniser, the speaking subject and you are now at the centre of my talk (hooks, 1989: 22).

The risk of mis-stepping here is considerable, but we take some comfort from the way in which co-writers typically describe the process of co-writing; the extent of ownership of the songs that they feel and express; and the care which facilitators and researchers take in negotiating how their song should be introduced if it is to be shared. Writing in response to experiencing an early Distant Voices performance, Ali Fraser, a University of Glasgow-based sociologist and friend of the project wrote:

The musicians, incredibly talented as they are, were not performers as much as conduits – carriers of a shared emotional intensity in a prison or workshop that was then passed on to the audience, who in turn carried this affect away with them.

This is, of course, the perception of one audience member and, even if it reflects similar views expressed by others, we are mindful that people may experience and understand these events in quite different ways. The perceptions of audience members may also differ from those of non-musician co-writers and of the musicians performing the songs. But the quote does suggest the possibility that sharing the work affects how people imagine integration and, perhaps, might come to practice it differently.

The importance of the preparation and disposition of the community receiving those who return is something that anthropologists have long noted in relation to rites of passage. Famously, the Austrian sociologist and military veteran Alfred Schütz (1945) discussed the importance of the receiving community in the reintegration of former army service personnel in his paper ‘The Homecomer’:

Much has been done and still more will be done to prepare the homecoming veteran for the necessary process of adjustment. However, it seems to be equally indispensable to prepare the home group accordingly. They have to learn through the press, the radio, the movies, that the man whom they await will be another and not the one they imagined him to be (376).

## An Open Door

'An Open Door' is the second song to be released from 'Not Known at this Address', the debut LP from the Distant Voices project. Originally recorded in HMYOI Polmont in March 2017, it was then re-recorded with Admiral Fallow in Chem19 Studios in January 2018.

The song was written by Louis Abbott and Lewis Anderson.

Lewis said:

*The song is based on the positives and negatives of being here [in prison] and the things I'll miss and things I won't miss. The vast majority I won't miss right enough!*



<https://www.voxliminis.co.uk/media/an-open-door/>

In Schütz's case, the perceived problem was that the community expected the returning veteran to be the same as the familiar person who had left. In our quite different context, the receiving community may have a distorted view of the returners' 'differentness' and deviance, as well as being ignorant about, insensitive to or disinterested in the challenges of re-entry (see Western, 2018). By sharing the songs and the stories of their making with a variety of audiences, we aim to interrupt these dynamics, re-familiarizing audiences with those who have been made strange by penal processes, and thus challenging the reductive conversations about crime, punishment and reintegration that often characterize public discourse.

### An Open Door?

In this penultimate section, we illustrate these processes of making, sharing and learning through discussion of one of the songs from *Not Known at This Address: An Open Door*. This song was written by Lewis Anderson and Louis Abbott in HMYOI [Her Majesty's Young Offenders Institution] Polmont; Scotland's only custodial facility for those sentenced to detention and aged 16-21. Lewis was approaching the end of a 3-year sentence when the session took place in March 2017 at the end of the second pilot phase of the Distant Voices project (and therefore before we commenced the fully developed research process reported in this paper). Of the song Lewis said simply: 'The song is based on the positives and negatives of being here [in prison] and the things I'll miss and things I won't miss. The vast majority I won't miss right enough!'. Although centered in certain respects on his experience of imprisonment, the song also explores how he was thinking and feeling about his impending release. We reproduce the song's lyrics below, but encourage readers to pause their reading here and listen to the song,

since – by their nature – songs represent and communicate experience not just through words but through sounds.<sup>42</sup>

### **An Open Door**

Hungry but I can't eat  
Not allowed and don't sleep in my own bed  
Any more -- A uniform to tell me who I am  
It's boring but it's so easy  
Same people all of the time and my girl on the brain  
I'm in dire need of change but I'll miss it all the same

*Give me the news and an honest pay cheque  
A season-book and a set of wheels  
A flash of your eye from across the party  
A quiet life, an open door.*

Strange place, familiar faces  
Old furniture brings it all back, the new makes me curious  
And I might miss the routine  
But I'd replace it with that scene in front of me anyway  
I'm amazed at the ways it's gonna change.

*Give me the news...*

It's amazing how surrounded by so many people  
You can still be lonely  
I'm only after opening my own doors

*Give me the news...*

Listeners can form their own impression of what the music and sound conveys. For us, it aptly captures the excitement but also the ambivalence and uncertainty that the lyrics express. In the words of the first verse, Lewis describes some of the fundamental degradations of imprisonment to which he has nonetheless become accustomed. The chorus is differently focused – musically and lyrically it is more insistent and urgent; in simple terms, it describes the conventional, ordinary life that Lewis wants and seeks.

The second verse describes Lewis's experience of home visits on temporary release as his final release becomes imminent. During his sentence, his mum had moved house so his visits were to a home that was not yet his, even though it was furnished with familiar items. He expresses the desire to be in this new home, strange though it is to him, juxtaposing it to the unchanging familiarity of the prison.  
working with a drum machine

---

<sup>42</sup> The song can be accessed online here: <https://www.voxliminis.co.uk/media/an-open-door/>, accessed 16<sup>th</sup> August 2019. A podcast about the writing of this song is also available here: <https://www.voxliminis.co.uk/media/not-known-at-this-address-podcasts/>, accessed 16<sup>th</sup> August 2019.



Sandwiched between repeating choruses, the song's middle-eight offers a simple but powerfully affecting statements of Lewis's experience of the loneliness of imprisonment; and of his aspiration for agency; all he wants is to be free to open his own doors.

'An Open Door' has been shared in many different contexts – from large scale mainstream gigs, to criminal justice sector events, to house gigs. In these contexts, it has often elicited very positive audience feedback centered on the clarity of its message (especially the inherently relatable plea of the chorus) and the empathy that it elicits. The song was also shared as part of a TREE undertaken by members of our core group. In that TREE, they played the song (along with two others) to different smaller audiences and recorded the discussions that it prompted.

One of these encounters took place in April 2018, at a church/community center in Glasgow's East End where two of the authors (MacLeod and McNeill) met with a group of 7 other men; a group who share in common either the experience of having been in prison, or being in recovery from substance use, or both. The men ranged in ages from the 30s to 60s. Their responses to An Open Door were interesting and varied.

One said: 'Definitely kinda liked aw that cos' I was in jail and it means everything; everything the same, exact same, identical.' Another noted that: 'When that door shuts at the end of the night, everybody wants the same thing'. One group member admired Lewis's resolution: '[i]t's as if he's just accepting where's he's at and just trying to get on with it... Dealing with what's he's got in front of him at the time, aye.'

But as the discussion developed, others reacted more sceptically to the ambivalence in the song. One said: 'I think he might have gave something away... he's saying 'I'm in dire need of change but I'll miss it all the same'. In other words, he's still got that wee hankering for the life...' [while this listener interprets this line as referring to the 'criminal' or criminalized life, most others see it as a reflection on the transition ahead, moving out of the institution]. Some also began to question whether the aspirations of the chorus were realistic in light of their own experiences of the realities of release and re-entry.

These responses – from a group of men who meet to sustain one another's recovery from various problems – reflect both solidarity with and empathy in the challenges of returning home. But, to some extent, they also allude to and reinforce the responsabilization that is commonly applied to returning prisoners (see Miller, 2014); a commitment to personal transformation is underlined here not necessarily as a precondition of hospitality, but as a pre-requisite for successful reintegration. Lewis needs the hospitality of 'An Open Door' it seems, but – on their account -- he also needs the wherewithal to find it, choose it, and pass through it – and not to look back. He needs to find welcoming hosts, but he also needs to know how to act as a guest in a new environment – and to resist returning to the life or life-style for which he feels some sense of belonging, however problematic that might be.

### **Conclusion: Imagining Hospitality**

In the introduction, we set out the challenges created by the hostilities faced by people trying to 'come home' from punishment. We went on to explain the design of a project which seeks to explore and to practice and to promote re/integration. We have used the notion of hospitality as a lens through which to reflect on our experience of the project to date.

In sum, we argue that hospitality is complex, challenging and difficult; both when offered and when received, hospitality interrupts our selves and disrupts our settings. We continue to try to develop creative practices and methods that do so safely. But we also recognize that these interruptions and disruptions are necessary to and critical in the project of imagining something better than the hostility that prevails today. Already, they have offered us glimpses of what more mutually supportive communities might require, what they might be, and what they might achieve.

Our colleague (and member of our advisory group) Alison Phipps, in her work on refugee integration through the arts, often speaks of 'multilateral integration',<sup>43</sup> partly in an attempt to put some conceptual distance between the ideas of integration and assimilation. In the kind of integration she seeks to imagine and practice, a guest does not integrate a host, nor a host a guest. We integrate together or not at all. In the final analysis, either we find ways to explore and imagine how to live together or we live apart. In our experience, the co-creative processes discussed above play a key role in the project of imagining this kind of integration – but they require careful planning and

---

<sup>43</sup> see <https://www.gla.ac.uk/research/az/unesco/researchandengagement/artshub/unescochairannuallecture/>, accessed 16<sup>th</sup> August 2019.

structure and facilitation. Like every form of art and social action, they require hard work as well as craft. And they require an acknowledgement of where power lies in the process and whether, when and how it can be shared.

In response to hostility, rather than simply asserting ‘absolute hospitality’, we must negotiate our way towards a practice of mutual, reciprocal, sustainable hospitality – one which may need to continuously negotiate the conditions that apply to us as both hosts and guests. To commit to this ongoing and always incomplete process is to live our lives and do our work continuously interrupted and disrupted. But the alternative is to dis-integrate.

- Anderson, S.** 2015. ‘Desistance, re-entry and song-writing’ *Discovering Desistance blog*, published 27<sup>th</sup> July 2015: <http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/2015/07/27/desistance-reentry-and-song-writing/>
- Bacchi, C.** 2009. *Analyzing Policy: What’s the Problem Represented to Be?* London: Pearson.
- Bauman, Z.** 2016. *Strangers at our Door*. Cambridge: Polity Press..
- Beck, D., and Purcell, R.** 2010. *Popular Education Practice for Youth and Community Development Work*. Empowering Youth and Community Work Practice. Southernhay East, Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Bey, H.** 2003. *T.A.Ž: The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism*. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Autonomedia.
- Blaikie, N. W. H.** 2009. *Designing Social Research. The logic of anticipation* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity.
- Bosworth, M., Campbell, B, Denby, B., Ferranti, S. and Santos, M.** 2005. ‘Doing Prison Research: Views from inside’, *Qualitative Inquiry* 11(2): 249-264.
- Brewin, K.** 2011. *Other*. London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd.
- Burke, L., Collett, S. and McNeill F.** 2018. *Reimagining Rehabilitation: Beyond the Individual*. London: Routledge.
- Bussu, S and Bartels, KPR.** 2013. Facilitative Leadership and the Challenge of Renewing Local Democracy in Italy. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* , 38 (6): 2256-2273.
- Carlen, P.** (ed.) 2008. *Imaginary Penalties*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Coffman, D.** 2011. ‘And They Lived Happily Ever After’: Community Music and Higher Education? *International Journal of Community Music*, 4(2): 97-104.
- Czarniawska, B.** 2008. *A Theory of Organizing*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Dickens, L. and Watkins, K.** 1999. ‘Action Research: Rethinking Lewin’, *Management Learning* 30(2): 127–140
- Freire, P.** 2000. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 30th anniversary ed. New York: Continuum.
- Garland, D.** 1985. *Punishment and Welfare: A history of penal strategies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Halliday, S., Burns, N., Hutton, N., McNeill, F., and Tata, C.** 2008. ‘Shadow writing and participant observation: A study of criminal justice social work around sentencing’ *Journal of Law and Society*, 35(2): 189-213.
- Heron, J.** 2005. ‘The Complete Facilitator’s Handbook’. London: Kogan Page.
- Higgins, L.** 2010. Representing Practice: Community Music and Arts-Based Research, in Coffman, D. (ed.) *CMA XII Harmonizing the Diversity That Is Community Music*



- Activity: Proceedings from the International Society for Music Education (ISME) 2010 Seminar of the Commission for Community Music Activity*, 103-109. Hangzhou, China: The Open University of China.
- Higgins, L.** 2012. 'The Community within Community Music' in McPherson, G. E. and Welch, G. F., *The Oxford Handbook of Music Education*, Volume 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press..
- hooks, b.** 1989. 'Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness'. *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media*, no. 36: 15-23.
- Kirkwood, S. and McNeill, F.** 2015. Kirkwood, S. and McNeill, F. (2015) 'Integration and Reintegration: Comparing pathways to citizenship through asylum and criminal justice' *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 15(5): 511-526.
- Loader, I. and Sparks, R.** 2012 'Beyond Lamentation: Towards a Democratic Egalitarian Politics of Crime and Justice', in T. Newburn and J. Peay (eds.) *Policing: Politics, Culture and Control*. Oxford: Hart.
- Ledwith, M., and Camppling, J.** 2005. *Community Development: A Critical Approach*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- McNeill, F.** 2015. 'Writing Ourselves into Reentry', *Discovering Desistance blog*, published 10<sup>th</sup> December 2015: <http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/2015/12/10/writing-ourselves-into-reentry/>
- McNeill, F.** 2017. 'Punishment, Rehabilitation and Reintegration', plenary address at the British Criminology Conference, Sheffield Hallam University, 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2017. Published online at: <http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/2017/08/29/punishment-rehabilitation-and-reintegration/>
- Maruna, S.** 2001. *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington: American Psychological Association Press.
- Miller, R.** 2014. 'Devolving the Carceral State: Race, Prisoner Reentry, and the Micro Politics of Urban Poverty Management', *Punishment and Society* 16(3): 305-335.
- Moore, A.** 2012. 'Following from the Front: Theorizing Deliberative Facilitation'. *Critical Policy Studies* 6 (2): 146-62.
- Murray, J. H.** 1997. *Hamlet on the Holodeck: The Future of Narrative in Cyberspace*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Nouwen, H. J. M.** 1975. *Reaching Out*. London: HarperCollins (Fount).
- Nugent, B. and Schinkel, M.** 2016. 'The Pains of Desistance' *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 16(5): 568- 584
- Piché, J., Gaucher, B. and Walby, K.** 2014. 'Facilitating Prisoner Ethnography: An Alternative Approach to "Doing Prisons Research Differently"' *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(4): 449-460.
- Platteel, T., Hulshof, H., Ponte, P., van Driel, J. & Verloop N.** 2010. Forming a collaborative action research partnership, *Educational Action Research*, 18(4): 429-451.
- Schütz, A.** 1945. 'The Homecomer'. *American Journal of Sociology* 50 (5): 369-76.
- Sennett, R.** 2008. *The Craftsman*. London: Allen Lane.
- Turner, V. W.** 1995. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. The Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures 1966. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Volf, M.** 1996. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.



- Yanow, D.** (2009). Dear author, dear reader: The third hermeneutic in writing and reviewing ethnography. In E. Schatz (Ed.), *Political Ethnography: What immersion brings to the study of power* (pp. 275-302). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yanow, D., & Schwartz-Shea, P.** 2012. *Interpretive Approaches to Research Design: Concepts and processes*, New York: Routledge.
- Wacquant, L.** 2011. 'Prisoner reentry as myth and ceremony'. *Dialectical Anthropology* 34: 605-620.
- Western, B.** 2018. *Homeward: Life in the year after prison*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Westmoreland, M. W.** 2008. 'Interruptions: Derrida and Hospitality'. *Kritike: An Online Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1): 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3860/krit.v2i1.566>.

**Fergus McNeill** is Professor of Criminology & Social Work at the University of Glasgow where he works in the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research and in Sociology.

**Alison Urie** is a community development and third sector leader who has led the development of the Glasgow-based creative arts community organisation Vox Liminis, which works in the criminal justice space. Her academic background is in medicine, community learning and development and theology.